



BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY



3 1761 10084831 6

MATERIALS ON
INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Copyright © 1970, 1975, 1978, 1979
by W.L. Hayhurst




MATERIALS ON
INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Copyright © 1970, 1975, 1978, 1979
by W.L. Hayhurst

Third Edition
1979

TORONTO
Faculty of Law
University of Toronto
1979

KE
2073
123
117



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Toronto

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

1979 Syllabus

1. PATENTS:

References: Fox, "Canadian Patent Law and Practice". 4th ed. (1969)
Terrell, "Patents", 12th ed. (1971)
Blanco-White, "Patents for Inventions", 4th ed. (1974)

(1) Introduction:

*Statute of Monopolies, 21 Jac. I c. 3 s.6; R.S.O. 1897 c.323, s.5
*Patent Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. P-4
*British United Shoe v. Fussell, (1908), 25 R.P.C. 631, 649-652

(2) Subject matter:

Lane-Fox v. Kensington, (1892), 9 R.P.C. 413, 416
*Re Bergey, (1977), 195 U.S.P.Q. 344
Re Chakrabarty, (1978), 197 U.S.P.Q. 72
*G.E.C.'s Application, (1943), 60 R.P.C. 1, 4
*Burroughs' Application, [1974] R.P.C. 147, 154, 158-161
*Parker v. Flook, (1978), 198 U.S.P.Q. 193
*Anonymous Application, 106 Canadian Patent Office Record, Aug.
1, 1978, p. xviii
Tennessee Eastman v. Commissioner, [1974] S.C.R. 111
Pollack's Application No. 839,690, (1972), 9 C.P.R. (2d) 283
Joos v. Commissioner, [1973] R.P.C. 59
*"Utility and Non-Statutory Subject Matter", Manual of Patent
Office Practice (Information Canada Catalogue R.G. 42-3/1974),
Chapter 12
Ciba-Geigy's Application, [1976] F.S.R. 77
Organon's Application, [1970] R.P.C. 574
Eli Lilly's Application, [1975] R.P.C. 438

(3) The patent specification:

*Natural Colour v. Bioschemes, (1915), 32 R.P.C. 256, 269-270
Valensi v. British Radio, [1973] R.P.C. 337, 377
Minerals Separation v. Noranda Mines, (1952), 69 R.P.C. 81, 92-93
*B.V.D. v. Canadian Celanese, [1937] S.C.R. 221, 230, 233,
236-237
Leithiser v. Pengo, [1974] 2 F.C. 954
Hoechst v. Gilbert, [1966] S.C.R. 189

(4) Novelty:

*35 U.S. Code, s. 104
*Electric and Musical Industries v. Lissen, (1939), 56 R.P.C.
23, 39, 41-43

(5) Obviousness:

- *35 U.S. Code, s. 103
- Graham v. John Deere, (1965), 383 U.S. 1
- IBM v. Xerox, (1977), 33 C.P.R. (2d) 24
- *Technograph v. Mills, [1969] R.P.C. 395 404-5, 407-8
- *Rado v. Tye, [1969] F.S.R. 563, 565-6
- *General Tire v. Firestone, [1971] R.P.C. 173, 232 245-6;
[1972] R.P.C. 457, 482-483, 485, 499-500
- I.C.I.'s Application, [1977] F.S.R. 434
- *Olin Mathieson v. Biorex, [1970] R.P.C. 157, 187-8
- Re Antle, (1971), 170 U.S.P.Q. 285
- Dow's Patent, [1975] R.P.C. 165, 169
- *Wood v. Gowshall, (1937), 54 R.P.C. 37, 40
- Tetra Molectric v. Japan Import, [1976] R.P.C. 547, 581
- Halocarbon v. Hoechst, (1977), 28 C.P.R. (2d) 63

(6) Utility:

- Societe Rhone-Poulenc v. Gilbert, (1967), 35 Fox Pat. C. 174;
[1968] S.C.R. 950
- Burton Parsons v. Hewlett-Packard, [1976] 1 S.C.R. 555
- Metalliflex v. Rodi & Wienenberger, [1961] S.C.R. 117, 121-122

(7) Infringement:

- *Henriksen v. Tallon, [1965] R.P.C. 434, 443, 445
- "McPhar v. Sharpe: A Post Mortem", (1967), 21 Bulletin of the
Patent and Trademark Institute of Canada 66 (on reserve)
- Rodi v. Showell, [1969] R.P.C. 367
- *Union Carbide v. Trans-Canada Feeds [1966] Ex. C.R. 884,
888-890
- *Wilderman v. Berk, (1925), 42 R.P.C. 79, 88
- Beecham v. Bristol, [1977] F.S.R. 215
- Morton-Norwich v. Intercen, [1976] F.S.R. 513, 521-526
- *35 U.S. Code, s. 271
- Copeland-Chatterson v. Hatton, (1906), 10 Ex. C.R. 224
- *Slater v. Payer, (1968), 38 Fox Pat. C. 139, 157, 163-4
- Solar Thomson v. Barton, [1977] R.P.C. 537
- *Preston & Gamble v. Bristol-Myers, (1979) C.P.R. (2d)

(8) The Paris Convention

2. COPYRIGHT:

References: Fox, "The Canadian Law of Copyright and Industrial Designs", 2nd ed. (1967)
Copinger & Skone James, "Copyright", 11th ed. (1971)
"Nimmer on Copyright" (1975)

(1) Introduction:

The Berne and Universal Copyright Conventions
*Canadian Admiral v. Rediffusion, [1954] Ex. C.R. 382, 394
*Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30
Performing Right Society v. Rangers, [1975] R.P.C. 626
Gramophone v. Cawardine, [1934] Ch. 450
Vigneux v. Canadian Performing Right, [1943] S.C.R. 348, 361;
[1945] A.C. 108

(2) Authorship and ownership:

Re Dickens, [1935] 1 Ch. 267
Hay v. Sloan, (1958), 12 D.L.R. (2d) 397
Netupsky v. Dominion Bridge, [1972] S.C.R. 368
Meikle v. Maufe, [1941] 3 All E.R. 144
Jefferys v. Boosey, (1854), 4 H.L.C. 815, 993
Gnass v. City of Alma, [1977] B.R.
Ludlow v. Canint, [1967] 2 Ex. C.R. 109
Wood v. Boosey, [1867] L.R. 2 Q.B. 340
Hartnett v. Pinkett, (1953), 103 L.J. 204
Merchant Adventurers v. Grew, [1973] R.P.C. 1, 10

(3) Subject matter:

*Francis, Day & Hunter v. Twentieth Century Fox, [1939] 4 D.L.R. 353, 358-361
*Ladbroke v. Hill, [1964] 1 All E.R. 465, 469, 475-478
Wellington v. Performing Right Society, I.L.R. [1937] Bomb. 724, 736
Pasichniak v. Dojacek, [1928] 2 D.L.R. 545
CAPAC v. CTV, [1968] S.C.R. 676

(4) Copyright Works, and Ideas:

Cuisenaire v. South West, [1969] S.C.R. 208
*Donoghue v. Allied, [1938] 1 Ch. 106, 109-110
*Moreau v. St. Vincent, [1950] Ex. C.R. 198, 204-205, 207
*Football League v. Littlewoods, [1959] 2 All E.R. 546, 552, 555-556

(5) Originality:

*Copinger & Skone James, 11th ed., ss. 124, 125, 130, 137
*Bauman v. Fussell, [1978] R.P.C. 485
Time v. Geis, (1968), 293 F. Supp. 130
Batlin v. Snyder, (1976), 189 U.S.P.Q. 753
*Walter v. Lane, [1900] A.C. 539, 548-9, 556
Roberton v. Lewis, [1976] R.P.C. 169, 175
Lipman v. Massachusetts, (1973), 475 F. 2d 565
*Macmillan v. Cooper, (1923), 40 T.L.R. 186, 188

(6) Scope of Protection:

- Warner Bros. v. CESM, (1971), 65 C.P.R. 215
*Deeks v. Wells, [1931] 4 D.L.R. 533, 547; [1933] 1 D.L.R. 353, 356-357
Francis, Day & Hunter v. Bron, [1963] 2 All E.R. 16
*Hanfstaengl v. Baines, [1895] A.C. 20, 30-31
Hawkes v. Paramount, [1934] 1 Ch. 593
*Cartwright v. Wharton, (1912), 25 O.L.R. 357, 362-363
Chilton v. Progress, [1895] 2 Ch. D. 29
*Harman v. Osborne, [1967] 2 All E.R. 324, 328
*Nichols v. Universal Pictures, (1930), 45 F. 2d. 119, 121
*Kantel v. Grant, [1933] Ex. C.R. 84, 87 94-96
Williams & Wilkins v. U.S., (1974), 487 F. 2d 1345; (1975), 95 S. Ct. 1344
Moorhouse v. University of New South Wales, [1976] R.P.C. 151
Hubbard v. Vosper, [1972] 1 All E.R. 1023, 1026-1028, 1031

3. INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS:

References: Fox, "Canadian Law of Copyright", 2nd ed. (1967), pp. 650-691
Russell-Clarke, "Copyright in Industrial Designs" 5th ed. (1974)

(1) Subject matter:

- *35 U.S. Code, s. 171
*Industrial Design Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. I-8
*Hensher v. Restawile, [1975] R.P.C. 31, 60, 62
*Re Bayer's Design, (1907), 24 R.P.C. 65, 76-77
Stenor v. Whitesides, (1948), 65 R.P.C. 1, 9
*Amp v. Utilux, [1972] R.P.C. 103, 107-110, 113
*Cimon v. Bench Made, [1965] 1 Ex. C.R. 811, 828-833
*Industrial Designs Rules, P.C. 1954-1853, s. 11
Ware v. Anglo-Italian (No. 1), [1922] Macg. C.C. 346
King Features v. Kleeman, [1941] A.C. 417, 427
Mazer v. Stein, (1954), 347 U.S. 201
Frankel v. Tegman, (1973), 367 F. Supp. 1051
*Re Clarke's Design, (1896), 13 R.P.C. 351, 358, 361

(2) Novelty and Originality:

- *Saunders v. Weil, (1893), 10 R.P.C. 29, 33
*Dean's Rag Book v. Pomerantz, (1930), 47 R.P.C. 485, 491
*Clatworthy v. Dale, [1929] S.C.R. 429, 434-5
*Rosedale v. Airfix, [1957] R.P.C. 239, 244
*Kilvington v. Goldberg, (1957), 16 Fox Pat. C. 164
Valor v. Main Gas, [1973] R.P.C. 871, 877

(3) Registration:

Melnor v. Lido, [1971] S.C.R. 72

(4) Infringement:

- *Walker v. Scott, (1892), 9 R.P.C. 482, 485

4. TRADE SECRETS:

References: Turner, "The Law of Trade Secrets" (1962)
Fox, "The Canadian Law of Trade Marks and Unfair
Competition", 3rd ed. (1972), Chapter 13

(1) Establishment of a contractual or confidential relationship:

*Triplex v. Scoriah, (1938), 55 R.P.C. 21, 28
Canadian Aero Services v. O'Malley, [1974] S.C.R. 592
Comment 28 C.P.R. (2d) 68
Hivac v. Park Royal, [1946] Ch. 169
United Sterling v. Felton, [1974] R.P.C. 162
Cranleigh v. Bryant, [1966] R.P.C. 81
*Saltman v. Campbell, (1948), 65 R.P.C. 203, 211-6
Ewen v. Gerofsky, (1977), 382 N.Y.S. (2d) 651
*Coco v. Clark, [1969] R.P.C. 41, 46-50
Kewanee v. Bicron, (1974), 416 U.S. 470

(2) The nature of the information sought to be protected:

Morris v. Gilman, (1943), 60 R.P.C. 20, 25
Interfirm Comparison v. Law Society, [1977] R.P.C. 137
Exchange Telegraph v. Central News, [1897] 2 Ch. 48
Microtherm v. Percy, [1957] R.P.C. 207
Church of Scientology v. Kaufman, [1973] R.P.C. 635,
649, 658

(3) Liability of persons who have not dealt with the plaintiff:

Lord Ashburton v. Pape, [1913] 2 Ch. 469
British Industrial Plastics v. Ferguson, (1941), 58 R.P.C. 1
*Printers v. Holloway, [1965] R.P.C. 239, 252-253
*Restatement of Torts, s. 758
*Conmar v. Universal, (1949), 172 F. 2d. 150, 156
*Stevenson v. MacDonald, (1951), 68 R.P.C. 190, 195;
(1952), 69 R.P.C. 10, 16
Abernethy v. Hutchison, (1825), 1 H. & Tw. 28
De Acosta v. Brown, (1944), 146 F. 2d. 408

(4) Effect of publication:

Warner-Lambert v. Reynolds, (1959), 178 F. Supp. 655
Quick Point v. Aronson, (1977), 196 U.S.P.Q. 281
Mustad v. Dosen, [1963] R.P.C. 41
*Seager v. Copydex, [1967] R.P.C. 349, 367-8
*International v. Kollar, [1968] 1 O.R. 669, 676
Reliable Toy v. Collins, (1950), 13 C.P.R. 53
Winston v. M.M.M., (1965), 350 F. 2d 134
Prince v. Automatic Partner, (1978), 198 U.S.P.Q. 618
Dunford v. Johnson, [1978] F.S.R. 143
Woodward v. Hutchins, [1977] 2 All E.R. 751

5. RESTRAINTS ON COMPETITION:

(1) Sales sub modo:

- Badische v. Isler, (1906), 23 R.P.C. 173, 180
- * Incandescent v. Cantelo, (1895), 12 R.P.C. 262, 264-265
- * National Phonograph v. Menck, (1911), 28 R.P.C. 229, 245-456

(2) U.S. developments:

- Hazeltine v. Zenith, (1969), 395 U.S. 100
- Pfizer v. F.T.C., (1968), 401 F. 2d 574
- Motion Picture Patents v. Universal, (1917), 243 U.S. 502
- * Morton Salt v. Suppiger, (1942), 314 U.S. 488

(3) The European Economic Community:

- Application des Gaz v. Falks, [1975] R.P.C. 421

(4) Enforceability of restraints:

- Darcy v. Allein, (1602), 77 E.R. 1260, 1263
- * Copeland-Chatterson v. Hatton, (1906), 10 Ex. C.R. 224, 237 ;
37 S.C.R. 651
- Mouchel v. Cubitt, (1907), 24 R.P.C. 194
- * Tool Metal v. Tungsten, (1955), 72 R.P.C. 209, 214, 218

(5) The Combines Investigation Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-23 as amended:

- Eli Lilly v. Marzone, (1977), 29 C.P.R. (2d) 253
- Stephens v. Gulf Oil, (1975), 11 O.R. (2d) 129
- Weidman v. Schragge, (1912), 46 S.C.R. 1

(6) Defences to infringement actions:

- Rodi v. Watchstraps, (1958), 30 C.P.R. 8, 15
- RBM v. Philips, (1973), 9 C.P.R. (2d) 46; 10 C.P.R. (2d) 23
- Amoco v. Texaco, [1976] 1 F.C. 258

(7) The public interest:

- Beloff v. Pressdram, [1973] R.P.C. 765
- City of Milwaukee v. Activated Sludge, (1934), 69 F. 2d 577

6. STATUTORY CURTAILMENTS:

- Formea v. Polymer, [1968] S.C.R. 754
- Libby-Owens-Ford v. Ford, [1970] S.C.R. 833
- Peterson v. Plastiseal, (1973), 8 C.P.R. (2d) 222; (1974),
14 C.P.R. (2d) 48, 52
- * Procter & Gamble v. Bristol-Myers, (1979) C.P.R. (2d)
- Hoechst v. Halocarbon, (1974), 15 C.P.R. (2d) 105, 120
- Teledyne v. Lido, (1979) C.P.R. (2d)